arXiv:1510.07140v1 [math.CO] 24 Oct 2015

L_p REGULAR SPARSE HYPERGRAPHS: BOX NORMS

PANDELIS DODOS, VASSILIS KANELLOPOULOS AND THODORIS KARAGEORGOS

Abstract. We consider some variants of the Gowers box norms, introduced by Hatami, and show their relevance in the context of sparse hypergraphs. Our main results are the following. Firstly, we prove a counting lemma which applies to L_p graphons for any $p > 1$. Secondly, we give natural examples of pseudorandom families, that is, sparse weighted uniform hypergraphs which satisfy relative versions of the counting and removal lemmas.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Overview.** Let $\langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in e \rangle$ be a nonempty finite family of probability spaces and let $(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ denote their product. Recall that the *box norm* of a random variable $f\colon \boldsymbol{X}_e \to \mathbb{R}$ is the quantity

$$\|f\|_{\square^e} := \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^e} f(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e^{(0)}, \mathbf{x}_e^{(1)} \in \boldsymbol{X}_e \Big]^{1/2^{|e|}}. \tag{1.1}$$

(For unexplained notation see Subsection 1.2 below.) These norms were introduced by Gowers [8, 10] and are important tools in additive and extremal combinatorics.

In this paper we will work with the following slight variants of the box norms which first appeared[1] in [13]: for an even integer $\ell \geqslant 2$ the *ℓ-box norm* of a random variable $f\colon \boldsymbol{X}_e \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{\square^e_\ell} := \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} f(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X}_e \Big]^{1/\ell^{|e|}}. \tag{1.2}$$

A large part of the basic theory of the box norms – as exposed, for instance, in [12, Appendix B] – can be extended without difficulty for these variants. We discuss this material in Section 2.

Our interest in the ℓ-box norms comes from the fact that they can often serve as the proper analogues of (1.1) in the context of sparse hypergraphs and related structures. In this direction our first main result is a counting lemma which applies to L_p graphons for any $p > 1$ and complements [2, Theorem 2.20]; it is presented in Section 3. The second part of this paper deals with *pseudorandom families* [6], a class of sparse weighted uniform hypergraphs whose most important feature is that

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 05C35, 05C65, 46B20, 46B25.

Key words: sparse hypergraphs, Gowers box norms.

[1] Actually, the framework in [13] is more general and includes several other variants of (1.1).

they satisfy relative versions of the counting and removal lemmas. Their definition is recalled in Section 4, but for a more complete discussion of their properties we refer the reader to [6]. We present two different types of examples of pseudorandom families (see Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 in the main text). They are both described using the ℓ-box norms.

1.2. **Background material.** Our general notation and terminology is standard. By $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ we denote the set of all natural numbers. As usual, for every positive integer n we set $[n] \coloneqq \{1, \dots, n\}$. If f is an integrable real-valued random variable defined on a probability space (X, Σ, μ), then by $\mathbb{E}[f(x) \,|\, x \in X]$ we shall denote the expected value of f; if the sample space X is understood from the context, then the expected value of f will be denoted simply by $\mathbb{E}[f]$. All necessary background from probability theory needed in this paper can be found, e.g., in [1].

As we have noted, the box norms and their variants are associated with finite products of probability spaces. It is more convenient, however, to work with the following more general structures.

Definition 1.1 ([15])**.** *A* hypergraph system *is a triple*

$$\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle, \mathcal{H}) \tag{1.3}$$

where n is a positive integer, $\langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle$ is a finite sequence of probability spaces and $\mathcal{H}$ is a hypergraph on $[n]$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is r-uniform, then $\mathscr{H}$ will be called an r-uniform hypergraph system.

For every hypergraph system $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle, \mathcal{H})$ by $(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ we shall denote the product of the spaces $\langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle$. More generally, let $e \subseteq [n]$ be nonempty and let $(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ denote the product of the spaces $\langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in e \rangle$. (By convention, we set $\boldsymbol{X}_\emptyset$ to be the empty set.) The σ-algebra $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e$ is not comparable with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, but it can be "lifted" to $\boldsymbol{X}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{B}_e = \big\{ \pi_e^{-1}(\mathbf{A}) : \mathbf{A} \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e \big\} \tag{1.4}$$

where $\pi_e \colon \boldsymbol{X} \to \boldsymbol{X}_e$ is the natural projection. Observe that if $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$, then there exists a unique random variable $\mathbf{f} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ such that

$$f = \mathbf{f} \circ \pi_e \tag{1.5}$$

and note that the map $L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \ni f \mapsto \mathbf{f} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ is a linear isometry. We will also deal with products of the space $(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. Specifically, let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \geqslant 2$. For every $\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)} = (x_i^{(0)})_{i \in e}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)} = (x_i^{(\ell-1)})_{i \in e}$ in $\boldsymbol{X}_e$ and every $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i \in e} \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}^e$ we set

$$\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)} = (x_i^{(\omega_i)})_{i \in e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_e. \tag{1.6}$$

Notice that if $\omega = m^e$ for some $m \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ (that is, $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i \in e}$ with $\omega_i = m$ for every $i \in e$), then $\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)} = \mathbf{x}_e^{(m)}$.

2. ℓ-BOX NORMS

Throughout this section let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle, \mathcal{H})$ denote a hypergraph system.

2.1. **Basic properties.** Let $e \subseteq [n]$ be nonempty and let $\ell \geqslant 2$ be an even integer. Also let $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. We first observe that the ℓ-box norm of f can be recursively defined as follows. If $e = \{j\}$ is a singleton, then by (1.2) we have

$$\|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f(x_j^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, x_j^{(0)}, \dots, x_j^{(\ell-1)} \in X_j \Big]^{1/\ell^{|e|}} = \big(\mathbb{E}[f]^\ell\big)^{1/\ell} = |\mathbb{E}[f]|. \tag{2.1}$$

On the other hand, if $|e| \geqslant 2$, then for every $j \in e$ we have

$$\|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\| \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f(\,\cdot\,, x_j^{(\omega)}) \big\|_{\square_\ell^{e\setminus\{j\}}}^{\ell^{|e|-1}} \,\Big|\, x_j^{(0)}, \dots, x_j^{(\ell-1)} \in X_j \Big]^{1/\ell^{|e|}}. \tag{2.2}$$

In the following proposition we gather further properties of the ℓ-box norms.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $e \subseteq [n]$ be nonempty and let $\ell \geqslant 2$ be an even integer.*

(a) (Gowers–Cauchy–Schwarz inequality) *For every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^e$ let $f_\omega \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. Then we have*

$$\Big| \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} f_\omega(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X}_e \Big] \Big| \leqslant \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} \|f_\omega\|_{\square_\ell^e}. \tag{2.3}$$

(b) *Let $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. Then we have $|\mathbb{E}[f]| \leqslant \|f\|_{\square_\ell^e}$. Moreover, if $\ell_1 \leqslant \ell_2$ are even positive integers, then $\|f\|_{\square_{\ell_1}^e} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square_{\ell_2}^e}$.*

(c) *If $|e| \geqslant 2$, then $\|\cdot\|_{\square_\ell^e}$ is a norm on the vector subspace of $L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ consisting of all $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ with $\|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} < \infty$.*

(d) *Let $1 < p \leqslant \infty$ and let q denote the conjugate exponent of p. Assume that $\ell \geqslant q$ and that $e = \{i, j\}$ is a doubleton. Then for every $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$, every $u \in L_p(X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i)$ and every $v \in L_p(X_j, \Sigma_j, \mu_j)$ we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}[f(x_i, x_j)u(x_i)v(x_j) \,|\, x_i \in X_i, x_j \in X_j]| \leqslant \|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} \|u\|_{L_p} \|v\|_{L_p}. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. (a) We follow the proof from [12, Lemma B.2] which proceeds by induction on the cardinality of e. The case "$|e| = 1$" is straightforward, and so let $r \geqslant 2$ and assume that the result has been proved for every $e' \subseteq [n]$ with $1 \leqslant |e'| \leqslant r-1$. Let $e \subseteq [n]$ with $|e| = r$ be arbitrary. Fix $j \in e$, set $e' = e \setminus \{j\}$ and for every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^e$ let $f_\omega \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. Moreover, for every $\omega_j \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}$ define $G_{\omega_j} : \boldsymbol{X}_{e'}^\ell \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$G_{\omega_j}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega_{e'} \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} f_{(\omega_{e'}, \omega_j)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\omega_{e'})}, x_j) \,\Big|\, x_j \in X_j \Big] \tag{2.5}$$

where $(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)$ is the unique element ω of $\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e$ such that $\omega(j)=\omega_j$ and $\omega(i)=\omega_{e'}(i)$ for every $i\in e'$. Observe that

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} f_\omega(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)})\,\Big|\,\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)}\in \boldsymbol{X}_e\Big]\Big| = \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega_j=0}^{\ell-1} G_{\omega_j}\Big]\Big|$$

and, by Hölder's inequality, $|\mathbb{E}[\prod_{\omega_j=0}^{\ell-1} G_{\omega_j}]|\leqslant \prod_{\omega_j=0}^{\ell-1}\mathbb{E}[G_{\omega_j}^\ell]^{1/\ell}$. Therefore, it is enough to show that for every $\omega_j\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[G_{\omega_j}^\ell]\leqslant \prod_{\omega_{e'}\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} \|f_{(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)}\|_{\square_\ell^e}^\ell. \tag{2.6}$$

Indeed, fix $\omega_j\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}$ and notice that, by (2.5),

$$G_{\omega_j}^\ell(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega_{e'}\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}}\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f_{(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\omega_{e'})},x_j^{(\omega)})\Big] \tag{2.7}$$

where the expectation is over all $x_j^{(0)},\dots,x_j^{(\ell-1)}\in X_j$. By (2.7) and Fubini's theorem, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}[G_{\omega_j}^\ell] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega_{e'}\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}}\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f_{(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\omega_{e'})},x_j^{(\omega)})\,\Big|\,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}\in\boldsymbol{X}_{e'}\Big]\Big]$$

where the outer expectation is over all $x_j^{(0)},\dots,x_j^{(\ell-1)}\in X_j$. Thus, applying the induction hypothesis and Hölder's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[G_{\omega_j}^\ell] &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega_{e'}\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} \big\|\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f_{(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)}(\,\cdot\,,x_j^{(\omega)})\big\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}}\Big]\\ &\leqslant \prod_{\omega_{e'}\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f_{(\omega_{e'},\omega_j)}(\,\cdot\,,x_j^{(\omega)})\big\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}}^{\ell^{|e'|}}\Big]^{1/\ell^{|e'|}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

By (2.2) and (2.8), we conclude that (2.6) is satisfied.

(b) It is a consequence of the Gowers–Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Specifically, for every $\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e$ let $f_\omega=f$ if $\omega=0^e$ and $f_\omega=1$ otherwise. By (2.3), we see that $|\mathbb{E}[f]|\leqslant\|f\|_{\square_\ell^e}$. Next, let $\ell_1\leqslant\ell_2$ be even positive integers. As before, for every $\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell_2-1\}^e$ let $f_\omega=f$ if $\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell_1-1\}^e$; otherwise, let $f_\omega=1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{\square_{\ell_1}^e}^{\ell_1^{|e|}} &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell_1-1\}^e} f(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)})\,\Big|\,\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell_1-1)}\in\boldsymbol{X}_e\Big]\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell_2-1\}^e} f_\omega(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)})\,\Big|\,\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell_2-1)}\in\boldsymbol{X}_e\Big] \overset{(2.3)}{\leqslant} \|f\|_{\square_{\ell_2}^e}^{\ell_1^{|e|}}\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\|f\|_{\square_{\ell_1}^e}\leqslant\|f\|_{\square_{\ell_2}^e}$.

(c) Absolute homogeneity is straightforward. The triangle inequality

$$\|f+g\|_{\square_\ell^e} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} + \|g\|_{\square_\ell^e}$$

follows by raising both sides to the power $\ell^{|e|}$ and then applying (2.3). Finally, let $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ with $\|f\|_{\square_\ell^e} = 0$ and observe that it suffices to show that $f = 0$ $\boldsymbol{\mu}_e$-almost everywhere. First we note that using (2.3) and arguing precisely as in [12, Corollary B.3] we have that $\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_R] = 0$ for every measurable rectangle R of $\boldsymbol{X}_e$ (that is, every set R of the form $\prod_{i\in e} A_i$ where $A_i \in \Sigma_i$ for every $i \in e$). We claim that this implies that $\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_A] = 0$ for every $A \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e$; this is enough to complete the proof. Indeed, fix $A \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Since f is integrable, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\,|f|\cdot\mathbf{1}_C] < \varepsilon$ for every $C \in \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_e(C) < \delta$. Moreover, by Caratheodory's extension theorem, there exists a finite family $R_1, \dots, R_m$ of pairwise disjoint measurable rectangles of $\boldsymbol{X}_e$ such that, setting $B = \bigcup_{k=1}^m R_k$, we have $\boldsymbol{\mu}_e(A \triangle B) < \delta$ (see, e.g., [1, Theorem 11.4]). Hence, $\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_B] = 0$ and so

$$|\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_A]| = |\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_A] - \mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_B]| \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\,|f|\cdot\mathbf{1}_{A\triangle B}] < \varepsilon.$$

Since ε was arbitrary, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}[f\cdot\mathbf{1}_A] = 0$.

(d) Set $I = \mathbb{E}[f(x_i,x_j)u(x_i)v(x_j)\,|\,x_i\in X_i, x_j\in X_j]$ and let ℓ' denote the conjugate exponent of ℓ. Notice that $1 < \ell' \leqslant p$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I| &= \Big|\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[f(x_i,x_j)\,v(x_j)\,|\,x_j\in X_j]\,u(x_i)\,\big|\,x_i\in X_i\big]\Big| \\
&\leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[f(x_i,x_j)\,v(x_j)\,|\,x_j\in X_j]^\ell\,\big|\,x_i\in X_i\big]^{1/\ell}\cdot\|u\|_{L_{\ell'}} \leqslant I_1^{1/\ell}\cdot\|u\|_{L_p}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where $I_1 = \mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f(x_i,x_j^{(\omega)})\,v(x_j^{(\omega)})\,\big|\,x_i\in X_i, x_j^{(0)},\dots,x_j^{(\ell-1)}\in X_j\big]$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f(x_i,x_j^{(\omega)})\,\big|\,x_i\in X_i\big]\cdot\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} v(x_j^{(\omega)})\,\Big|\,x_j^{(0)},\dots,x_j^{(\ell-1)}\in X_j\Big] \\
&\leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} f(x_i,x_j^{(\omega)})\,\big|\,x_i\in X_i\big]^\ell\,\Big|\,x_j^{(0)},\dots,x_j^{(\ell-1)}\in X_j\Big]^{1/\ell}\cdot\|v\|_{L_{\ell'}}^\ell \\
&\overset{(2.2)}{=} \|f\|_{\square_\ell^e}^\ell\cdot\|v\|_{L_{\ell'}}^\ell \leqslant \|f\|_{\square_\ell^e}^\ell\cdot\|v\|_{L_p}^\ell.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

By (2.9) and (2.10), the result follows. □

2.2. **The (ℓ,p)-box norms.** We will need the following L_p versions of the ℓ-box norms. We remark that closely related norms appear in [3]. Recall that by $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle(X_i,\Sigma_i,\mu_i) : i\in[n]\rangle, \mathcal{H})$ we denote a hypergraph system.

Definition 2.2. *Let $e \subseteq [n]$ be nonempty and let $\ell \geqslant 2$ be an even integer. Also let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$ and $f \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. The* (ℓ,p)-box norm *of f is defined by*

$$\|f\|_{\square_{\ell,p}^e} := \big\||f|^p\big\|_{\square_\ell^e}^{1/p}. \tag{2.11}$$

Moreover, for every $f \in L_\infty(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ we set

$$\|f\|_{\square_{\ell,\infty}^e} := \|f\|_{L_\infty}. \tag{2.12}$$

We have the following analogue of Proposition 2.1.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $e \subseteq [n]$ be nonempty and let $\ell \geqslant 2$ be an even integer.*

(a) *Let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$. If $f_\omega \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ for every $\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} |f_\omega|^p(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X}_e \Big] \leqslant \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} \|f_\omega\|^p_{\square^e_{\ell,p}}. \tag{2.13}$$

(b) *Let $1 < p, q < \infty$ be conjugate exponents, that is, $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Then for every $f \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ and every $g \in L_q(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ we have*

$$\|fg\|_{\square^e_\ell} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \cdot \|g\|_{\square^e_{\ell,q}}. \tag{2.14}$$

(c) *Assume that $|e| \geqslant 2$ and let $1 \leqslant p < \infty$. Then $\|\cdot\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}}$ is a norm on the vector subspace of $L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ consisting of all $f \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ with $\|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} < \infty$. Moreover, the following hold.*

(i) *For every $f \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ we have $\|f\|_{L_p} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}}$.*

(ii) *For every $1 \leqslant p_1 \leqslant p_2 < \infty$ and every $f \in L_{p_2}(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ we have $\|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p_1}} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p_2}}$.*

(iii) *For every $f \in L_\infty(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ we have $\lim_{p\to\infty} \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} = \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,\infty}}$.*

Proof. Part (a) follows immediately by (2.3). For part (b) fix a pair $1 < p, q < \infty$ of conjugate exponents, and let $f \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ and $g \in L_q(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$ be arbitrary. We define $F, G\colon \boldsymbol{X}_e^\ell \to \mathbb{R}$ by $F(\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} f(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)})$ and $G(\mathbf{x}_e^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_e^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} g(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)})$. By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\|fg\|^{\ell^{|e|}}_{\square^e_\ell} \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\,|F\cdot G|\,] \leqslant \mathbb{E}[\,|F|^p]^{1/p} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\,|G|^q]^{1/q}.$$

Noticing that $\mathbb{E}[\,|F|^p]^{1/p} = \|f\|^{\ell^{|e|}}_{\square^e_{\ell,p}}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\,|G|^q]^{1/q} = \|g\|^{\ell^{|e|}}_{\square^e_{\ell,q}}$ we conclude that (2.14) is satisfied.

We proceed to show part (c). Arguing as in the proof of the classical Minkowski inequality we see that the (ℓ,p)-box norm satisfies the triangle inequality. Absolute homogeneity is clear and so, by Proposition 2.1, we conclude that $\|\cdot\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}}$ is indeed a norm. Next, observe that part (c.i) follows by (2.13) applied for $f_\omega = f$ if $\omega = \{0\}^e$ and $f_\omega = 1$ otherwise. For part (c.ii) set $p = p_2/p_1$ and notice that

$$\|f\|^{p_1}_{\square^e_{\ell,p_1}} = \big\||f|^{p_1}\big\|_{\square^e_\ell} \overset{(2.14)}{\leqslant} \big\||f|^{p_1}\big\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} = \|f\|^{p_1}_{\square^e_{\ell,p_2}}$$

Finally, let $f \in L_\infty(\boldsymbol{X}_e, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu}_e)$. By part (c.i), we have $\|f\|_{L_p} \leqslant \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \leqslant \|f\|_{L_\infty}$. Since $\lim_{p\to\infty} \|f\|_{L_p} = \|f\|_{L_\infty}$, we obtain that $\lim_{p\to\infty} \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} = \|f\|_{L_\infty} = \|f\|_{\square^e_{\ell,\infty}}$ and the proof is completed. □

3. A counting lemma for L_p graphons

Let (X, Σ, μ) be a probability space and recall that a *graphon*[2] is an integrable random variable $W\colon X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ which is symmetric, that is, $W(x,y) = W(y,x)$

[2]We remark that in several places in the literature, graphons are required to be $[0,1]$-valued, and the term *kernel* is used for (not necessarily bounded) integrable, symmetric random variables.

for every $x, y \in X$. If, in addition, W belongs to L_p for some $p > 1$, then W is said to be an L_p *graphon* (see [2]).

Now let n be a positive integer and let $\mathcal{G}$ be a nonempty graph on $[n]$. Recall that the *maximum degree* of $\mathcal{G}$ is the number $\Delta(\mathcal{G}) \coloneqq \max\big\{|\{e \in \mathcal{G} : i \in e\}| : i \in [n]\big\}$. Given two graphons W and U, a natural problem (which is of particular importance in the context of graph limits – see [14]) is to estimate the quantity

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\{i,j\}\in\mathcal{G}} W(x_i,x_j)\,\Big|\,x_1,\dots,x_n \in X\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\{i,j\}\in\mathcal{G}} U(x_i,x_j)\,\Big|\,x_1,\dots,x_n \in X\Big]\Big|.$$

If W and U are uniformly bounded, then this problem has a very satisfactory answer (see, e.g., [14]). The unbounded case, however, is quite involved. Recently, there was progress in this direction in [2, Theorem 2.20] where effective estimates were obtained provided that W and U are L_p graphons for some $p > \Delta(\mathcal{G})$. It is important to note that this integrability restriction is necessary at this level of generality. Indeed, if $p < \Delta(\mathcal{G})$, then the above difference may not even be defined.

Nevertheless, we have the following theorem which has the advantage of being applicable to L_p graphons for any $p > 1$ but requires a rather different type of integrability assumption.

Theorem 3.1. *Let Δ be a positive integer, $C \geqslant 1$ and $1 < p \leqslant \infty$. If $p = \infty$ or $\Delta = 1$, then we set $\ell = 2$; otherwise, let*

$$\ell = \min\big\{2n : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } 2n \geqslant p^{(\Delta-1)^{-1}}(p^{(\Delta-1)^{-1}} - 1)^{-1}\big\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Also let $\mathscr{G} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n]\rangle, \mathcal{G})$ be a 2-uniform hypegraph system with $\Delta(\mathcal{G}) = \Delta$. For every $e \in \mathcal{G}$ let $f_e, g_e \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{f}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \leqslant 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{g}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \leqslant 1 \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbf{f}_e$ and $\mathbf{g}_e$ are as in (1.5) for f_e and g_e respectively. Assume that for every $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ with $\mathcal{G}_1 \cap \mathcal{G}_2 = \emptyset$ we have

$$\Big\|\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}_1} f_e \prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}_2} g_e\Big\|_{L_p} \leqslant C. \tag{3.3}$$

(Here, we follow the convention that the product of an empty family of functions is equal to the constant function 1.) Then we have

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} f_e\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} g_e\Big]\Big| \leqslant C \cdot \sum_{e\in\mathcal{G}} \|\mathbf{f}_e - \mathbf{g}_e\|_{\square^e_\ell}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Set $M = |\mathcal{G}|$ and write $\mathcal{G} = \{e_1, \dots, e_M\}$. Since

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} f_e\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} g_e\Big] = \sum_{k=1}^{M} \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{s<k} g_{e_s}(f_{e_k} - g_{e_k}) \prod_{s>k} f_{e_s}\Big]$$

it suffices to show that for every $k \in [M]$ we have

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{s<k} g_{e_s}(f_{e_k} - g_{e_k}) \prod_{s>k} f_{e_s}\Big]\Big| \leqslant C \cdot \|\mathbf{f}_{e_k} - \mathbf{g}_{e_k}\|_{\square^{e_k}_\ell}. \tag{3.5}$$

So, fix $k \in [M]$, and set $e = e_k$ and $H_e = f_{e_k} - g_{e_k} \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Moreover, for every $e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\}$ let $s \in [M] \setminus \{k\}$ be such that $e' = e_s$ and set $h_{e'} = g_{e_s}$ if $s < k$ and $h_{e'} = f_{e_s}$ if $k < s$; notice that $h_{e'} \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$. Thus, setting

$$I = \mathbb{E}\Big[H_e \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\}} h_{e'}\Big],$$

we need to show that $|I| \leqslant C \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_e\|_{\square_\ell^\varepsilon}$ where $\mathbf{H}_e$ is as in (1.5) for H_e.

To this end, we first observe that if $\Delta = 1$, then the result is straightforward. Indeed, in this case we have $\ell = 2$ and the edges of $\mathcal{G}$ are pairwise disjoint. Hence, by part (b) of Proposition 2.1 and part (c.ii) of Proposition 2.3, we see that

$$|I| = |\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{H}_e]| \cdot \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\}} |\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_{e'}]| \leqslant \|\mathbf{H}_e\|_{\square_2^\varepsilon} \cdot \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\}} \|\mathbf{h}_{e'}\|_{\square_{2,p}^{e'}} \overset{(3.2)}{\leqslant} C \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_e\|_{\square_2^\varepsilon}.$$

(As before, $\mathbf{h}_{e'}$ is as in (1.5) for $h_{e'}$ for every $e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\}$.) Therefore, in what follows we will assume that $\Delta \geqslant 2$. To simplify the exposition we will also assume that $p \neq \infty$. (The proof for the case $p = \infty$ is similar.) Write $e = \{i, j\}$, and set $\mathcal{G}(i) = \{e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\} : i \in e'\}$ and $\mathcal{G}^*(i) = \{e' \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\} : i \notin e'\}$; notice that $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{e\} = \mathcal{G}(i) \cup \mathcal{G}^*(i)$. Let ℓ' be the conjugate exponent of ℓ and observe that, by (3.1), we have $\ell \geqslant q'$ where q' is the conjugate exponent of $p^{(\Delta-1)^{-1}}$. Hence,

$$1 < \ell' \leqslant p^{(\Delta-1)^{-1}} \leqslant p. \tag{3.6}$$

We set

$$I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbf{H}_e(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_j) \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}(i)} \mathbf{h}_{e'}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{e' \setminus \{i\}})\Big] \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$I_{\mathcal{G}(i)} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}(i)} \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'}|^{\ell'}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{e' \setminus \{i\}})\Big] \tag{3.8}$$

where both expectations are over all $x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus\{i\}} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{[n]\setminus\{i\}}$.

Claim 3.2. *We have* $|I| \leqslant C \cdot I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)}^{1/\ell}$.

Proof of Claim 3.2. Since $i \notin e'$ for every $e' \in \mathcal{G}^*(i)$, we have

$$I = \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{H}_e(x_i, x_j) \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}(i)} \mathbf{h}_{e'}(x_i, x_{e' \setminus \{i\}}) \,\big|\, x_i \in X_i\big] \cdot \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}^*(i)} \mathbf{h}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_{e'})\Big].$$

By Hölder's inequality, (3.3), (3.6) and (3.7), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |I| &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbf{H}_e(x_i, x_j) \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}(i)} \mathbf{h}_{e'}(x_i, x_{e' \setminus \{i\}}) \,\big|\, x_i \in X_i\big]^{\ell}\Big]^{1/\ell} \cdot \Big\| \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}^*(i)} h_{e'} \Big\|_{L_{\ell'}} \\ &\leqslant I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)}^{1/\ell} \cdot \Big\| \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}^*(i)} h_{e'} \Big\|_{L_p} \leqslant C \cdot I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)}^{1/\ell} \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

We proceed with the following claim.

Claim 3.3. *We have* $I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)} \leqslant \|\mathbf{H}_e\|_{\square_\ell^e}^\ell \cdot I_{\mathcal{G}(i)}^{1/\ell'}$.

Proof of Claim 3.3. Note that $j \notin e'$ for every $e' \in \mathcal{G}(i)$, and so

$$I_{e,\mathcal{G}(i)} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbf{H}_e(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_j) \,\big|\, x_j \in X_j\big] \cdot \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}(i)} \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbf{h}_{e'}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{e'\setminus\{i\}})\Big].$$

Using this observation the claim follows by Hölder's inequality and arguing precisely as in the proof of Claim 3.2. □

The following claim is the last step of the proof.

Claim 3.4. *We have* $I_{\mathcal{G}(i)} \leqslant 1$.

Proof of Claim 3.4. We may assume, of course, that $\mathcal{G}(i)$ is nonempty. We set $m = |\mathcal{G}(i)|$ and we observe that $1 \leqslant m \leqslant \Delta - 1$. Therefore, by (3.6), we see that

$$1 < (\ell')^r \leqslant (\ell')^{\Delta-1} \leqslant p \tag{3.9}$$

for every $r \in [m]$. Write $\mathcal{G}(i) = \{e'_1, \ldots, e'_m\}$ and for every $r \in [m]$ let $j_r \in [n]$ such that $e'_r = \{i, j_r\}$. For every $d \in [m]$ set

$$Q_d = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{r=d}^{m} \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_r}|^{(\ell')^d}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_r})\Big] \tag{3.10}$$

and note that

$$Q_1 = I_{\mathcal{G}(i)} \;\text{ and }\; Q_m = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_m}|^{(\ell')^m}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_m})\Big]. \tag{3.11}$$

(Here, the expectation is over all $x_i^{(0)}, \ldots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus\{i\}} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{[n]\setminus\{i\}}$.) Now observe that it is enough to show that for every $d \in [m-1]$ we have

$$Q_d \leqslant Q_{d+1}^{1/\ell'}. \tag{3.12}$$

Indeed, by (3.12), we see that $Q_1 \leqslant Q_m^{1/(\ell')^{m-1}}$. Hence, by (3.11), the monotonicity of the L_p norms and part (a) of Proposition 2.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathcal{G}(i)} &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_m}|^{(\ell')^m}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_m})\Big]^{\ell'/(\ell')^m} \\ &\overset{(3.9)}{\leqslant} \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_m}|^{p}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_m})\Big]^{\ell'/p} \leqslant \big\|\mathbf{h}_{e'_m}\big\|_{\square_{\ell,p}^{e'_m}}^{\ell\ell'} \overset{(3.2)}{\leqslant} 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

It remains to show (3.12). Fix $d \in [m-1]$ and notice that $j_d \notin e'_r$ for every $r \in \{d+1, \ldots, m\}$. Thus,

$$Q_d = \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_d}|^{(\ell')^d}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_d}) \,\big|\, x_{j_d} \in X_{j_d}\big] \cdot \prod_{r=d+1}^{m} \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_r}|^{(\ell')^d}(x_i^{(\omega)}, x_{j_r})\Big].$$

By Hölder's inequality and arguing as in the proof of (3.13), we see that

$$Q_d \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'_d}} |\mathbf{h}_{e'_d}|^{(\ell')^d}(\mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{e'_d})\Big]^{1/\ell}\cdot Q_{d+1}^{1/\ell'} \leqslant \big\|\mathbf{h}_{e'_d}\big\|^{\ell(\ell')^d}_{\square^{e'_d}_{\ell,p}}\cdot Q_{d+1}^{1/\ell'}$$

as desired. □

By Claims 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4, we conclude that (3.5) is satisfied, and so the entire proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed. □

4. Pseudorandom families

First we need to introduce some notation. Let n, r be two positive integers with $n \geqslant r \geqslant 2$ and let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n]\rangle, \mathcal{H})$ be an r-uniform hypergraph system. Given $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\partial e = \{e' \subseteq e : |e'| = |e| - 1\}$ and set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\partial e} \coloneqq \Big\{ \bigcap_{e'\in\partial e} A_{e'} : A_{e'} \in \mathcal{B}_{e'} \text{ for every } e' \in \partial e\Big\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_e. \tag{4.1}$$

Also recall that for every $f \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ the *cut norm* of f is defined by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\partial e}} = \sup\Big\{ \Big| \int_A f\, d\boldsymbol{\mu}\Big| : A \in \mathcal{S}_{\partial e}\Big\}. \tag{4.2}$$

The cut norm is a standard tool in extremal combinatorics (see, e.g., [7, 14, 15]). It is weaker than the box norm, but for bounded functions these two norms are essentially equivalent (see [9, Theorem 4.1]).

The following class of weighted hypergraphs was introduced in [6, Definition 6.1]. Closely related definitions appear in [4, 16].

Definition 4.1. *Let $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geqslant r \geqslant 2$, and let $C \geqslant 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1$. Also let $1 < p \leqslant \infty$ and let q denote the conjugate exponent of p. Finally, let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n]\rangle, \mathcal{H})$ be an r-uniform hypergraph system. For every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\nu_e \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ be a nonnegative random variable. We say that the family $\langle \nu_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ is* (C, η, p)-pseudorandom *if the following hold.*

- (C1) *For every nonempty $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ we have $\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} \nu_e\big] \geqslant 1 - \eta$.*
- (C2) *For every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists $\psi_e \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ with $\|\psi_e\|_{L_p} \leqslant C$ and satisfying the following properties.*
  - (a) *We have $\|\nu_e - \psi_e\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\partial e}} \leqslant \eta$.*
  - (b) *For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0,1\}$ let $g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that either $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant \nu_{e'}$ or $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant 1$. Let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_e$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_e$ be as in (1.5) for ν_e and ψ_e respectively. Then we have*

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} g^{(\omega)}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, \mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus e}) \,\big|\, \mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{[n]\setminus e}\big]\Big| \,\mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e\Big]\Big| \leqslant \eta.$$

(C3) *Let $e \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ be nonempty, and define $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}} \colon \boldsymbol{X}_e \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x}_e) = \mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}} \nu_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, \mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus e}) \,\big|\, \mathbf{x}_{[n]\setminus e} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{[n]\setminus e}\big]$. Then, setting*

$$\ell \coloneqq \min\Big\{2n : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } 2n \geqslant 2q + \Big(1 - \frac{1}{C}\Big) + \frac{1}{p}\Big\} \tag{4.3}$$

(where $1/p = 0$ if $p = \infty$), we have $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}}^{\ell}] \leqslant C + \eta$.

Definition 4.1 looks rather technical at first sight, but it is possible to justify combinatorially conditions (C1)–(C3); see the discussion in [6, Subsection 6.1]. As we have already noted in the introduction, the most important property of pseudorandom families is that they satisfy relative versions of the counting and removal lemmas; see [6, Theorems 2.2 and 7.1].

4.1. **Main results.** In the second part of this paper our goal is to give examples of pseudorandom families. The following theorem is our first result in this direction. Its proof is given in Section 5.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geqslant 3$, $C \geqslant 1$ and $1 < p \leqslant \infty$, and let ℓ be as in* (4.3)*. Also let $0 < \eta \leqslant (4C)^{-n\ell^n}$ and let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n]\rangle, \mathcal{H})$ be a hypergraph system with $\mathcal{H} = \binom{n}{n-1}$. (In particular, $\mathscr{H}$ is $(n-1)$-uniform.) For every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\lambda_e \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $\varphi_e \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ be nonnegative random variables, and let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_e$ be as in* (1.5) *for λ_e and φ_e respectively. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied.*

(I) *We have*

$$1 - \eta \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e \in \mathcal{H}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_e^{n_{e,\omega}}(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X}\Big] \leqslant 1 + \eta \tag{4.4}$$

for any choice of $n_{e,\omega} \in \{0, 1\}$.

(II) *For every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ we have $\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \leqslant C$.*

Then the family $\langle \lambda_e + \varphi_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ is (C', η', p)-pseudorandom where $C' = (4C)^{n\ell}$ and $\eta' = (4C)^{n\ell}\, \eta^{1/\ell^{n-1}}$.

We will briefly comment on the assumptions of Theorem 4.2. We first observe that condition (I) is a modification of the "linear forms condition" introduced in [16, Definition 2.8]. (In particular, if $\ell = 2$, then (4.4) coincides with the linear forms condition.) It expresses the fact that the weighted hypergraph $\langle \lambda_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ contains roughly the expected number of copies of the ℓ-blow-up of $\mathcal{H}$ and its subhypergraphs; as such, it is a rather strong independence-type assumption. On the other hand, note that condition (II) is just an integrability assumption for the function φ_e. Thus, we see that the family $\langle \lambda_e + \varphi_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ is a perturbation of $\langle \lambda_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ where only integrability conditions are imposed on each "noise" φ_e.

The next result provides a different type of examples of pseudorandom families.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geqslant 3$, $C \geqslant 1$ and $1 < p \leqslant \infty$, and let ℓ be as in* (4.3)*. Also let $0 < \eta \leqslant 1/(n\ell)$ and let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n]\rangle, \mathcal{H})$ be a*

hypergraph system with $\mathcal{H} = \binom{n}{n-1}$. *(Again observe that* $\mathscr{H}$ *is* $(n-1)$*-uniform.) For every* $e \in \mathcal{H}$ *let* $\nu_e \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ *and* $\psi_e \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ *be nonnegative random variables, and let* $\boldsymbol{\nu}_e$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\psi}_e$ *be as in* (1.5) *for* ν_e *and* ψ_e *respectively. Assume that the following conditions are satisfied.*

(I) *We have*

$$1 - \eta \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e \in \mathcal{H}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} \boldsymbol{\psi}_e^{n_{e,\omega}}(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X} \Big] \leqslant C + \eta \tag{4.5}$$

for any choice of $n_{e,\omega} \in \{0,1\}$.

(II) *For every* $e \in \mathcal{H}$ *we have* $1 \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} < \infty$, $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} \leqslant C$ *and*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e\|_{\square^e_\ell} \leqslant \eta \, (C \cdot M)^{-(n-1)\ell} \tag{4.6}$$

where $M = \max\{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} : e \in \mathcal{H}\}$.

Then the family $\langle \nu_e \colon e \in \mathcal{H} \rangle$ *is* (C, η', p)*-pseudorandom where* $\eta' = n\ell\eta$.

Theorem 4.3 was motivated by [5, Lemmas 5 and 6] which dealt[3] with the case $C = 1$, $p = \infty$ and $\psi_e = 1$ for every $\in \mathcal{H}$. Its proof is given in Section 6.

5. Proof of Theorem 4.2

Let n, C, p, ℓ and η be as in the statement of the theorem and set

$$\bar{C} = (2C)^{n\ell}, \quad \bar{\eta} = (2C)^{n\ell} \, \eta^{1/\ell^{n-1}}, \quad C' = (4C)^{n\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta' = (4C)^{n\ell} \eta^{1/\ell^{n-1}}. \tag{5.1}$$

Also let $\mathscr{H} = (n, \langle (X_i, \Sigma_i, \mu_i) : i \in [n] \rangle, \mathcal{H})$ be a hypergraph system with $\mathcal{H} = \binom{n}{n-1}$ and for every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\lambda_e \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ and $\varphi_e \in L_p(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_e, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ be nonnegative random variables satisfying (I) and (II).

As in Section 3, we will follow the convention that the product of an empty family of functions is equal to the constant function 1. We will also need the following lemma. Its proof is given in Subsection 5.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $e \in \mathcal{H}$ *and let* $i \in [n]$ *be the unique integer such that* $e = [n] \setminus \{i\}$. *For every* $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ *and every* $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}$ *let* $g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ *such that either:* (i) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \lambda_{e'}$, *or* (ii) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \varphi_{e'}$, *or* (iii) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant 1$. *Then we have*

$$\Big| \mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e - 1)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}} g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)} \in X_i \Big] \Big| \leqslant \bar{\eta} \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}} g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i \Big] \leqslant \bar{C} \tag{5.3}$$

where $\bar{\eta}$ *and* $\bar{C}$ *are as in* (5.1).

[3] We remark that if $\psi_e = 1$ for every $e \in \mathcal{H}$, then a slight weakening of (4.6) is only needed. Specifically, one can assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - 1\|_{\square^e_2} \leqslant \eta \, M^{-(n-1)}$ where $M = \max\{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e\|_{L_\infty} : e \in \mathcal{H}\}$; see [5] for details.

After this preliminary discussion we are ready to enter into the main part of the proof. For every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ set $\nu_e = \lambda_e + \varphi_e$ and let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_e$ be as in (1.5) for ν_e. Recall that we need to verify conditions (C1)–(C3) in Definition 4.1 for the family $\langle \nu_e : e \in \mathcal{H} \rangle$.

First, let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be nonempty. Since $0 \leqslant \lambda_e \leqslant \nu_e$, by (4.4), we have

$$1 - \eta \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} \lambda_e\Big] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e\in\mathcal{G}} \nu_e\Big]$$

and so, condition (C1) is satisfied.

Next, for every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\psi_e = \varphi_e + 1$. By part (c.i) of Proposition 2.3,

$$\|\psi_e\|_{L_p} \leqslant \|\varphi_e\|_{L_p} + 1 \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_e\|_{\square^e_{\ell,p}} + 1 \leqslant C + 1 \overset{(5.1)}{\leqslant} C'.$$

Fix $e \in \mathcal{H}$ and for every $f \in \partial e$ let $A_f \in \mathcal{B}_f$. For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$ we define $g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ by setting $g^{(\omega)}_{e'} = 1$ if $\omega \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$ and $g^{(0)}_{e'} = \mathbf{1}_{A_f}$ where $f = e' \cap e$. By (5.2), we have

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e - 1)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{f\in\partial e} \mathbf{1}_{A_f}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)} \in X_i\Big]\Big| \leqslant \bar{\eta}. \tag{5.4}$$

Hence, by (5.4), the definition of the cut norm and the fact that $\nu_e - \psi_e = \lambda_e - 1$, we conclude that $\|\nu_e - \psi_e\|_{\mathcal{S}_{\partial e}} \leqslant \eta'$. That is, condition (C2.a) is satisfied.

We proceed to verify condition (C2.b). Let $e \in \mathcal{H}$ be arbitrary and let $i \in [n]$ be the unique integer such that $e = [n] \setminus \{i\}$. Also let $\omega \in \{0, 1\}$. For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ let $g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that either $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant \nu_{e'}$ or $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant 1$. We set

$$\mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,\nu} = \big\{e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\} : 0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant \nu_{e'}\big\} \;\text{ and }\; \mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,1} = \big\{e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\} : 0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant 1\big\}$$

and for every $e' \in \mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,\nu}$ let

$$g^{(\omega)}_{e',\lambda} = g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \mathbf{1}_{[g^{(\omega)}_{e'} \leqslant \lambda_{e'}]} \;\text{ and }\; g^{(\omega)}_{e',\varphi} = (g^{(\omega)}_{e'} - \lambda_{e'}) \mathbf{1}_{[g^{(\omega)}_{e'} > \lambda_{e'}]}. \tag{5.5}$$

Finally, for every $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,\nu}$ set

$$A^{(\omega)}_{\mathcal{G}} = \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}} g^{(\omega)}_{e',\lambda} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,\nu}\setminus\mathcal{G}} g^{(\omega)}_{e',\varphi} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,1}} g^{(\omega)}_{e'}. \tag{5.6}$$

(Recall that, by convention, the product of an empty family of functions is equal to the constant function 1.) The following properties are straightforward consequences of the relevant definitions.

(a) For every $\omega \in \{0, 1\}$ and every $e' \in \mathcal{G}^{(\omega)}_{e,\nu}$ we have $g^{(\omega)}_{e',\lambda}$, $g^{(\omega)}_{e',\varphi} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$, $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e',\lambda} \leqslant \lambda_{e'}$, $0 \leqslant g^{(\omega)}_{e',\varphi} \leqslant \varphi_{e'}$ and $g^{(\omega)}_{e'} = g^{(\omega)}_{e',\lambda} + g^{(\omega)}_{e',\varphi}$.

(b) For every $\mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e$ and every $x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)} \in X_i$ we have

$$\prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} g^{(\omega)}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) = \sum_{\mathcal{G}_0\subseteq\mathcal{G}^{(0)}_{e,\nu}} \sum_{\mathcal{G}_1\subseteq\mathcal{G}^{(1)}_{e,\nu}} \prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} A^{(\omega)}_{\mathcal{G}_\omega}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}). \tag{5.7}$$

By (a), we see that every factor of $A_{\mathcal{G}}^{(\omega)}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 5.1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} \mathbb{E}\big[g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i) \,\big|\, x_i \in X_i\big] \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e\Big] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e - 1)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)} \in X_i\Big] \\
&\quad \overset{(5.7)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{G}_0\subseteq\mathcal{G}_{e,\nu}^{(0)}} \sum_{\mathcal{G}_1\subseteq\mathcal{G}_{e,\nu}^{(1)}} \mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e - 1)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega\in\{0,1\}} A_{\mathcal{G}_\omega}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, x_i^{(1)} \in X_i\Big] \\
&\quad \overset{(5.2)}{\leqslant} 2^{|\mathcal{G}_{e,\nu}^{(0)}|}\, 2^{|\mathcal{G}_{e,\nu}^{(1)}|}\, \bar{\eta} \leqslant 4^{n-1}\bar{\eta} \overset{(5.1)}{\leqslant} \eta'
\end{aligned}$$

which implies, of course, that condition (C2.b) is satisfied.

It remains to verify condition (C3). Fix $e \in \mathcal{H}$ and, as above, let $i \in [n]$ be the unique integer such that $e = [n] \setminus \{i\}$. Also let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ be nonempty and let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}} \colon \boldsymbol{X}_e \to \mathbb{R}$ be as in Definition 4.1. Then notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}}^{\ell}] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}\big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}} \nu_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i) \,\big|\, x_i \in X_i\big]^{\ell} \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e\Big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}} \nu_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, observe that for every $\mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e$ and every $x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}} \nu_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) = \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}} (\lambda_{e'} + \varphi_{e'})(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) = \\
&\qquad = \sum_{\mathcal{G}_0\subseteq\mathcal{G}} \cdots \sum_{\mathcal{G}_{\ell-1}\subseteq\mathcal{G}} \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}_\omega} \lambda_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}\setminus\mathcal{G}_\omega} \varphi_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, setting

$$B_{\mathcal{G}'} = \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}'} \lambda_{e'} \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}\setminus\mathcal{G}'} \varphi_{e'}$$

for every $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e,\mathcal{G}}^{\ell}] &= \sum_{\mathcal{G}_0\subseteq\mathcal{G}} \cdots \sum_{\mathcal{G}_{\ell-1}\subseteq\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} B_{\mathcal{G}_\omega}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i\Big] \\
&\overset{(5.3)}{\leqslant} 2^{|\mathcal{G}|\ell}\bar{C} \leqslant 2^{(n-1)\ell}\bar{C} \overset{(5.1)}{\leqslant} C'.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that condition (C3) is satisfied, and so the entire proof of Theorem 4.2 is completed.

5.1. **Proof of Lemma 5.1.** The argument is similar to that in the proofs of [4, Lemma 6.3] and [16, Proposition 5.1]. Proofs of this sort originate from the work of Green and Tao [11, 12].

We proceed to the details. First we need to introduce some pieces of notation. Let d be a (possibly empty) subset of e and write $\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}$. (Recall that $i \in [n]$ is the unique integer such that $e = [n] \setminus \{i\}$.) Notice that every element of the space $\boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}}$ is written as $(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}})$ where $\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}$. On the other hand, for every $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}} = (x^{(0)}_j)_{j\in d\cup\{i\}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}} = (x^{(\ell-1)}_j)_{j\in d\cup\{i\}} \in \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}$, every $d' \subseteq d \cup \{i\}$ and every $\omega = (\omega_j)_{j\in d'} \in \{0, \ldots, \ell-1\}^{d'}$ by $\mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d'}$ we shall denote the unique element of $\boldsymbol{X}_{d'}$ defined by the rule

$$\mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d'} = (x^{(\omega_j)}_j)_{j\in d'}. \tag{5.8}$$

Next, for every $d \subseteq e$ we define $F_d, G_d \colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows. First, set

$$F_d(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\ldots,\ell-1\}^d} \big(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_e(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_d) - 1\big) \tag{5.9}$$

and notice that F_d does not depend on the value of $x^{(0)}_i, \ldots, x^{(\ell-1)}_i \in X_i$. The definition of the function G_d is somewhat more involved. For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0, \ldots, \ell-1\}$ let $g^{(\omega)}_{e'}$ be as in the statement of the lemma and let $\mathbf{g}^{(\omega)}_{e'}$ be as in (5.1) for $g^{(\omega)}_{e'}$. Given $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and $\omega \in \{0, \ldots, \ell-1\}^{e'\cap(d\cup\{i\})}$ it is convenient to introduce an auxiliary function $g_{e',d,\omega} \colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by defining $g_{e',d,\omega}(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}})$ according to the following cases

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{g}^{(\omega_i)}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) & \text{if } d \subseteq e', \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{e'\cap(d\cup\{i\})}) & \text{if } d \nsubseteq e' \text{ and } g^{(\omega_i)}_{e'} \leqslant \lambda_{e'}, \\ 1 & \text{if } d \nsubseteq e' \text{ and either } g^{(\omega_i)}_{e'} \leqslant \varphi_{e'} \text{ or } g^{(\omega_i)}_{e'} \leqslant 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

(Here, ω_i is the i-th coordinate of ω. Moreover, $\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$ stands for the natural projection of $\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}$ into $\boldsymbol{X}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$; note that this projection is well-defined since $e' \setminus (d \cup \{i\}) \subseteq e \setminus d$.) We now define

$$G_d = \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\ldots,\ell-1\}^{e'\cap(d\cup\{i\})}} g_{e',d,\omega}. \tag{5.11}$$

Finally, we set

$$Q_d = \mathbb{E}[F_d\, G_d] \quad \text{and} \quad R_d = \mathbb{E}[G_d]. \tag{5.12}$$

Claim 5.2. *The following hold.*

(a) *We have that $Q_\emptyset$ and $R_\emptyset$ coincide with the quantities appearing in the left-hand side of* (5.2) *and* (5.3) *respectively.*
(b) *We have $|Q_e| \leqslant 2\eta$ and $0 \leqslant R_e \leqslant 1 + \eta$.*

Proof of Claim 5.2. For part (a) it is enough to observe that

$$F_\emptyset(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)}) = \boldsymbol{\lambda}_e(\mathbf{x}_e) - 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_\emptyset(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)}) &= \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{\{i\}}} \mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega_i)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}, x_i^{(\omega)}) \\ &= \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

For part (b) notice that

$$Q_e = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^e} \big(\lambda_e(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) - 1\big) \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e'}^{n_{e',\omega}}(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X} \Big]$$

and

$$R_e = \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e'}^{n_{e',\omega}}(\mathbf{x}_e^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)} \in \boldsymbol{X} \Big]$$

where for every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{e'}$ we have $n_{e',\omega} \in \{0,1\}$ and $n_{e',\omega} = 1$ if and only if $g_{e'}^{(\omega_i)} \leqslant \lambda_{e'}$. Therefore, by (4.4), we conclude that $|Q_e| \leqslant 2\eta$ and $0 \leqslant R_e \leqslant 1 + \eta$. □

The following claim is the last step of the proof.

Claim 5.3. *For every $d \subsetneq e$ and every $j \in e \setminus d$ we have $Q_{d\cup\{j\}} \geqslant 0$, and*

$$|Q_d|^{1/\ell^{|d|}} \leqslant (2C)^\ell \, Q_{d\cup\{j\}}^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad R_d^{1/\ell^{|d|}} \leqslant (2C)^\ell \, R_{d\cup\{j\}}^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}}. \tag{5.13}$$

Proof of Claim 5.3. We will only show that $|Q_d|^{1/\ell^{|d|}} \leqslant (2C)^\ell \, Q_{d\cup\{j\}}^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}}$. The proof of the corresponding inequality for R_d is identical. (In particular, it follows by setting $F_d = 1$ below.)

Fix $d \subsetneq e$ and $j \in e \setminus d$, and set $e_j = [n] \setminus \{j\}$ and $f = [n] \setminus (d \cup \{i,j\})$. Also write $\boldsymbol{X}_{e_j} = \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^\ell = X_j \times \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^\ell$, and let $\pi\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^\ell \to \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^\ell$ denote the natural projection.

For every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ we define $\mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^\ell \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathbf{g}_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\omega)}). \tag{5.14}$$

(Recall that ω_i is the i-th coordinate of ω and $\mathbf{g}_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)}$ is as in (5.1) for $g_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)}$.) Observe that, by (5.10), for every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ we have

$$g_{e_j,d,\omega} = \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega} \circ \pi. \tag{5.15}$$

Next, let Ω_λ, Ω_φ and Ω_1 denote the subsets of $\{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ consisting of all ω such that $g_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)} \leqslant \lambda_{e_j}$, $g_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)} \leqslant \varphi_{e_j}$ and $g_{e_j}^{(\omega_i)} \leqslant 1$ respectively. Set

$$\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\lambda} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}, \quad \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\varphi} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G}_{j,d,1} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_1} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega} \tag{5.16}$$

and notice that these functions are defined on $\boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}}$. We also define $G'_{j,d}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by the rule

$$G'_{j,d} = \prod_{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e,e_j\}} \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'\cap(d\cup\{i\})}} g_{e',d,\omega}. \tag{5.17}$$

By (5.11) and (5.15)–(5.17), we have $G_d = G'_{j,d}\cdot\big[(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,1})\circ\pi\big]$ and so

$$Q_d = \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j\in X_j]\cdot(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,1})\big] \tag{5.18}$$

where the outer expectation is over the space $\boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}}$. Denote by ℓ' the conjugate exponent of ℓ and recall that ℓ is an even positive integer. By (5.18), Hölder's inequality and the fact that $0\leqslant \mathbf{G}_{j,d,1}\leqslant 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_d| &= \big|\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j\in X_j]\cdot\big((\mathbf{G}^{1/\ell}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\mathbf{G}^{1/\ell'}_{j,d,\lambda})\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,1}\big)\big]\big| \\ &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j\in X_j]^{\ell}\cdot\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda}\big]^{1/\ell}\cdot\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\mathbf{G}^{\ell'}_{j,d,\varphi}]^{1/\ell'}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Now define $\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}, \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\varphi}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}},\dots,\mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e_j}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\varphi}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}},\dots,\mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\varphi} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{e_j}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}). \tag{5.21}$$

By (5.14) and (5.16), we see that $0\leqslant \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\lambda}\leqslant \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}$ and $0\leqslant \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi}\leqslant \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\varphi}$. Therefore, by (5.19), we have

$$|Q_d| \leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j\in X_j]^{\ell}\cdot\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}\big]^{1/\ell}\cdot\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\overline{\mathbf{G}}^{\ell'}_{j,d,\varphi}]^{1/\ell'}. \tag{5.22}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j\in X_j]^{\ell}\cdot\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}\big] = Q_{d\cup\{j\}} \tag{5.23}$$

which implies, in particular, that $Q_{d\cup\{j\}}\geqslant 0$. On the other hand, by (5.20), (5.21) and part (a) of Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\overline{\mathbf{G}}^{\ell'}_{j,d,\varphi}] \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e_j}\|^{|\Omega_\lambda|}_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell}}\cdot\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\ell'}_{e_j}\|^{|\Omega_\varphi|}_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell}}. \tag{5.24}$$

By (4.4), it is clear that $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{e_j}\|_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell}}\leqslant 1+\eta\leqslant 2$. Moreover, by (4.3), we see that $1<\ell'<p$. Hence, by part (c.ii) of Proposition 2.3 and condition (II) in Theorem 4.2, we obtain that $\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\ell'}_{e_j}\|_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell}}\leqslant\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{e_j}\|^{\ell'}_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell,p}}\leqslant C^{\ell'}$. Thus, by (5.24),

$$\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\lambda}\,\overline{\mathbf{G}}^{\ell'}_{j,d,\varphi}]^{1/\ell'} \leqslant 2^{|\Omega_\lambda|/\ell'}\cdot C^{|\Omega_\varphi|}\leqslant (2C)^{|\Omega_\lambda|+|\Omega_\varphi|}\leqslant (2C)^{\ell^{|d|+1}}. \tag{5.25}$$

Combining (5.22), (5.23) and (5.25), we get that $|Q_d|\leqslant Q^{1/\ell}_{d\cup\{j\}}(2C)^{\ell^{|d|+1}}$ which is equivalent to saying that $|Q_d|^{1/\ell^{|d|}}\leqslant (2C)^{\ell}\,Q^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}}_{d\cup\{j\}}$. The proof of Claim 5.3 is completed. □

By induction and using Claim 5.3, we see that

$$|Q_\emptyset| \leqslant (2C)^{(n-1)\ell}\, Q_e^{1/\ell^{n-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad R_\emptyset \leqslant (2C)^{(n-1)\ell}\, R_e^{1/\ell^{n-1}}. \tag{5.26}$$

Invoking (5.26) and Claim 5.2, we conclude that (5.2) and (5.3) are satisfied, and so the proof of Lemma 5.1 is completed.

6. Proof of Theorem 4.3

Let $\mathscr{H}$ and $\langle \nu_e, \psi_e : e \in \mathcal{H}\rangle$ be as in the statement of the theorem, and for every $e \in \mathcal{H}$ let $\boldsymbol{\nu}_e$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_e$ be as in (1.5) for ν_e and ψ_e respectively.

The following lemma is the first main step of the proof.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $e \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $i \in [n]$ be the unique integer such that $e = [n] \setminus \{i\}$. For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}$ let $g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathcal{B}_{e'}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that either:* (i) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \nu_{e'}$, *or* (ii) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \psi_{e'}$, *or* (iii) $0 \leqslant g_{e'}^{(\omega)} \leqslant 1$. *Then*

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e)(\mathbf{x}_e) \prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}} g_{e'}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_e, x_i^{(\omega)}) \,\Big|\, \mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e, x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i\Big]\Big| \leqslant \eta. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. It is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.1. Specifically, let $d \subseteq e$ be arbitrary. For every $e' \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ with $d \subseteq e'$ and every $\omega \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ we define $g_{e',d,\omega} \colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{\ell} \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting

$$g_{e',d,\omega}(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega_i)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\omega)}) \tag{6.2}$$

where ω_i is the i-th coordinate of ω and $\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega_i)}$ is as in (1.5) for $g_{e'}^{(\omega_i)}$. Also define $F_d, G_d \colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{\ell} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_d(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^d} (\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e)(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}, \mathbf{x}_d^{(\omega)}) \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$G_d = \prod_{\substack{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}\\ d\subseteq e'}} \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}} g_{e',d,\omega}. \tag{6.4}$$

(Here, as in Section 3, we follow the convention that the product of an empty family of functions is equal to the constant function 1.) Finally, let

$$Q_d = \mathbb{E}[F_d\, G_d]. \tag{6.5}$$

Note that $Q_\emptyset$ coincides with the quantity appearing in the left-hand side of (6.1). Moreover, we have

$$Q_e = \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_e - \boldsymbol{\psi}_e\|_{\square_\ell^e}^{\ell^{n-1}}. \tag{6.6}$$

Claim 6.2. *For every $d \subsetneq e$ and every $j \in e \setminus d$ we have $Q_{d\cup\{j\}} \geqslant 0$ and*

$$|Q_d|^{1/\ell^{|d|}} \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{\ell} \cdot Q_{d\cup\{j\}}^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}}. \tag{6.7}$$

Proof of Claim 6.2. As in the proof of Claim 5.3, fix $d \subsetneq e$ and $j \in e \setminus d$, and set $e_j = [n] \setminus \{j\}$ and $f = [n] \setminus (d \cup \{i,j\})$. Write $\boldsymbol{X}_{e_j} = \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} = X_j \times (\boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}})$, and for every $\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ define $\mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \mathbf{g}^{(\omega_i)}_{e_j}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}). \tag{6.8}$$

If $\pi\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}}$ is the natural projection map, then, by (6.2), we see that $g_{e_j,d,\omega} = \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega} \circ \pi$ for every $\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$.

Let Ω_ν, Ω_ψ and Ω_1 denote the subsets of $\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ consisting of all ω such that $g^{(\omega_i)}_{e_j} \leqslant \nu_{e_j}$, $g^{(\omega_i)}_{e_j} \leqslant \psi_{e_j}$ and $g^{(\omega_i)}_{e_j} \leqslant 1$ respectively. We set

$$\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\nu} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}, \quad \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\psi} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\psi} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G}_{j,d,1} = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_1} \mathbf{g}_{e_j,d,\omega}. \tag{6.9}$$

Moreover, let $G'_{j,d}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d} \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$G'_{j,d} = \prod_{\substack{e'\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e,e_j\}\\ d\subseteq e'}} \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}} g_{e',d,\omega}. \tag{6.10}$$

Observe that $G_d = G'_{j,d} \cdot \big[(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,1}) \circ \pi\big]$. Hence, if ℓ' denotes the conjugate exponent of ℓ, then, by Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_d| &= \big|\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j \in X_j]\cdot(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\psi}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,1})\big]\big| \\ &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j \in X_j]^{\ell}\big]^{1/\ell}\cdot\mathbb{E}\big[(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\psi})^{\ell'}\big]^{1/\ell'} \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where the outer expectation is over the space $\boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}}$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G'_{j,d}\,|\,x_j \in X_j]^{\ell}\big] = Q_{d\cup\{j\}} \tag{6.12}$$

and, consequently, $Q_{d\cup\{j\}} \geqslant 0$. Next, define $\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\nu}, \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\psi}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_f \times \boldsymbol{X}^{\ell}_{d\cup\{i\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\nu}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\lambda} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{e_j}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) \tag{6.13}$$

and

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\psi}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(0)}_{d\cup\{i\}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell-1)}_{d\cup\{i\}}) = \prod_{\omega\in\Omega_\varphi} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{e_j}(\mathbf{x}_f, \mathbf{x}^{(\omega)}_{d\cup\{i\}}). \tag{6.14}$$

By (6.8) and (6.9), we see that $0 \leqslant \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu} \leqslant \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\nu}$ and $0 \leqslant \mathbf{G}_{j,d,\varphi} \leqslant \overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\varphi}$. On the other hand, by (4.3), we have $1 < \ell' < p$. Therefore, by (6.13), (6.14) and parts (a) and (c.ii) of Proposition 2.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\big[(\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\nu}\,\mathbf{G}_{j,d,\psi})^{\ell'}\big]^{1/\ell'} &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[(\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\nu}\,\overline{\mathbf{G}}_{j,d,\psi})^{\ell'}\big]^{1/\ell'} \\ &\leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e_j}\|^{|\Omega_\nu|}_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell,p}} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e_j}\|^{|\Omega_\psi|}_{\square^{e_j}_{\ell,p}} \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{\ell^{|d|+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

By (6.11), (6.12) and (6.15), we see that $|Q_d| \leqslant Q^{1/\ell}_{d\cup\{j\}}(C\cdot M)^{\ell^{|d|+1}}$ and the proof of Claim 6.2 is completed. □

By the above claim, we have

$$|Q_\emptyset| \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{(n-1)\ell}\, Q_e^{1/\ell^{n-1}}.$$

As we have noted, $Q_\emptyset$ coincides with the quantity appearing in the left-hand side of (6.1). Thus, combining the previous estimate with (4.6) and (6.6), we conclude that (6.1) is satisfied, and so the proof of Lemma 5.1 is completed. □

We proceed with the following lemma which is the second main step of the proof.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $e \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $i \in [n]$ be the unique integer such that $e = [n]\setminus\{i\}$. Also let $e' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}$ and $\omega' \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}$. For every $e'' \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}$ and every $\omega \in \{0,\dots,\ell-1\}$ with $(e'',\omega) \neq (e',\omega')$ let $g_{e''}^{(\omega)} \in L_1(\boldsymbol{X},\mathcal{B}_{e''},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ such that either:* (i) $0 \leqslant g_{e''}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \nu_{e''}$, *or* (ii) $0 \leqslant g_{e''}^{(\omega)} \leqslant \psi_{e''}$, *or* (iii) $0 \leqslant g_{e''}^{(\omega)} \leqslant 1$. *Then*

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[(\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'})(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus\{i\}},x_i^{(\omega')}) \prod_{\substack{e''\in\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}\\ \omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}\\ (e'',\omega)\neq(e',\omega')}} \mathbf{g}_{e''}^{(\omega)}(\mathbf{x}_{e''\setminus\{i\}},x_i^{(\omega)})\Big]\Big| \leqslant \eta \tag{6.16}$$

where the expectation is over all $\mathbf{x}_e \in \boldsymbol{X}_e$ and $x_i^{(0)},\dots,x_i^{(\ell-1)} \in X_i$. (Here, $\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{e''\setminus\{i\}}$ are the projections of $\mathbf{x}_e$ into $\boldsymbol{X}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{e''\setminus\{i\}}$ respectively.)

Proof. Without loss of generality, and to simplify the exposition, we will assume that $\omega'=0$. For every $d \subseteq e'\setminus\{i\}$ let $F_d, G_d\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d}\times \boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{\ell} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$F_d(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d},\mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^d} (\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'})(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})},\mathbf{x}_d^{(\omega)},x_i^{(0)})$$

and

$$G_d = \prod_{(e'',\omega)\in\Gamma_d} g_{e'',d,\omega}$$

where: (a) the set Γ_d consists of all pairs $(e'',\omega) \in \mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}\times\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{d\cup\{i\}}$ such that $d\subseteq e''\setminus\{i\}$ and $(e'',\omega_i)\neq(e',0)$, and (b) for every $(e'',\omega)\in\Gamma_d$ the function $g_{e'',d,\omega}\colon \boldsymbol{X}_{e\setminus d}\times\boldsymbol{X}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{\ell}\to\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$g_{e'',d,\omega}(\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d},\mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{d\cup\{i\}}^{(\ell-1)}) = \mathbf{g}_{e''}^{(\omega_i)}(\mathbf{x}_{e''\setminus(d\cup\{i\})},\mathbf{x}_d^{(\omega_d)},x_i^{(\omega_i)}).$$

(As before, ω_i is the i-th coordinate of ω and $\mathbf{g}_{e''}^{(\omega_i)}$ is as in (1.5) for $g_{e''}^{(\omega_i)}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{e''\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$ are the projections of $\mathbf{x}_{e\setminus d}$ into $\boldsymbol{X}_{e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}_{e''\setminus(d\cup\{i\})}$ respectively.)

Next, setting $Q_d=\mathbb{E}[F_d\,G_d]$ and arguing precisely as in the proof of Lemma 6.1, we obtain that $Q_{d\cup\{j\}}\geqslant 0$ and $|Q_d|^{1/\ell^{|d|}} \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{\ell}\, Q_{d\cup\{j\}}^{1/\ell^{|d|+1}}$ for every $d\subsetneq e'\setminus\{i\}$ and every $j\in e'\setminus(d\cup\{i\})$. Therefore,

$$|Q_\emptyset| \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{(n-2)\ell}\, Q_{e'\setminus\{i\}}^{1/\ell^{n-2}}. \tag{6.17}$$

Now observe that $|Q_\emptyset|$ coincides with the quantity appearing in the left-hand side of (6.16). On the other hand, we have

$$Q_{e'\setminus\{i\}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}\,\mathbf{G}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}\,|\,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}\in\boldsymbol{X}_{e'}]$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'\setminus\{i\}}} (\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'})(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}^{(\omega)}, x_i^{(0)})$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}(\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(0)},\dots,\mathbf{x}_{e'}^{(\ell-1)}) = \prod_{\omega\in\{0,\dots,\ell-1\}^{e'\setminus\{i\}}\times[\ell-1]^{\{i\}}} \mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega_i)}(\mathbf{x}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}^{(\omega_{e'\setminus\{i\}})}, x_i^{(\omega_i)}).$$

(The arguments of the functions in the definitions of $\mathbf{F}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{e'\setminus\{i\}}$ follow from our previous conventions, mutatis mutandis.) Thus, by part (a) of Proposition 2.1, we obtain that

$$Q_{e'\setminus\{i\}} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}}^{\ell^{n-2}} \cdot \prod_{\omega=1}^{\ell-1} \|\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega)}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}}^{\ell^{n-2}}$$

and consequently, by (6.17),

$$|Q_\emptyset| \leqslant (C\cdot M)^{(n-2)\ell} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}} \cdot \prod_{\omega=1}^{\ell-1} \|\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega)}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}}. \tag{6.18}$$

By part (c.ii) of Proposition 2.3, for every $\omega\in[\ell-1]$ we have

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega)}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}} \leqslant \|\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega)}\|_{\square_{\ell,1}^{e'}} \leqslant \|\mathbf{g}_{e'}^{(\omega)}\|_{\square_{\ell,p}^{e'}}.$$

Hence, by (6.18) and condition (II),

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_\emptyset| &\leqslant (C\cdot M)^{(n-2)\ell} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}} \cdot (C\cdot M)^{\ell-1} \\ &\leqslant (C\cdot M)^{(n-1)\ell} \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}-\boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'}\|_{\square_\ell^{e'}} \leqslant \eta \end{aligned}$$

and the proof of Lemma 6.3 is completed. □

We are now in a position to complete the proof of the theorem. Recall that we need to show that the family $\langle\nu_e : e\in\mathcal{H}\rangle$ satisfies conditions (C1)–(C3) in Definition 4.1 for the constants C and $\eta' = n\ell\eta$. For condition (C1) let $\mathcal{G}\subseteq\mathcal{H}\setminus\{e\}$ be nonempty. Set $m=|\mathcal{G}|$ and let $e'_1,\dots,e'_m$ be an enumeration of $\mathcal{G}$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}}\nu_{e'}\Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}}\psi_{e'}\Big]\Big| &\leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{m}\Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{k<j}\psi_{e'_k}(\nu_{e'_j}-\psi_{e'_j})\prod_{k>j}\nu_{e'_k}\Big]\Big| \\ &\overset{(6.1)}{\leqslant} (n-1)\,\eta \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

and so, by condition (I), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}}\nu_{e'}\Big] \geqslant \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{e'\in\mathcal{G}}\psi_{e'}\Big] - (n-1)\cdot\eta \geqslant 1-\eta'.$$

That is, condition (C1) is satisfied. Condition (C2.a) follows arguing precisely as in the proof of Theorem 4.2, while condition (C2.b) is an immediate consequence of (6.1). Finally, for condition (C3) fix $e\in\mathcal{H}$ and let $i\in[n]$ be the unique integer

such that $e = [n] \setminus \{i\} \in \mathcal{H}$. Also let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H} \setminus \{e\}$ be nonempty. By the choice of η', it is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\ell}_{e,\mathcal{G}}] \leqslant C + (|\mathcal{G}| \cdot \ell + 1)\, \eta. \tag{6.20}$$

To this end, set

$$\Delta := \Big| \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_{e' \setminus \{i\}}, x_i^{(\omega)}) \Big] - \mathbb{E}\Big[\prod_{\omega=0}^{\ell-1} \prod_{e' \in \mathcal{G}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{e'}(\mathbf{x}_{e' \setminus \{i\}}, x_i^{(\omega)}) \Big] \Big|$$

(both expectations are over the space $\boldsymbol{X}_e \times X_i^{\ell}$) and note that, by condition (I),

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\ell}_{e,\mathcal{G}}] \leqslant \Delta + C + \eta.$$

Next, by enumerating the set $\mathcal{G} \times \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}$ and applying a telescoping argument as in (6.19), we see that Δ is bounded by a sum of $|\mathcal{G}| \cdot \ell$ terms each of which has the form of the quantity appearing in the left-hand side of (6.16). Therefore, by Lemma 6.3, we conclude that (6.20) is satisfied, and so the entire proof of Theorem 4.3 is completed.

References

[1] P. Billingsley, *Probability and Measure*, 3rd edition, John Wiley & Sons, 1995.

[2] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, H. Cohn and Y. Zhao, *An L^p theory of sparse graph convergence I: limits, sparse random graph models, and power law distributions*, preprint (2014), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1401.2906`.

[3] P. Candela, *Uniformity norms and nilsequences* (*an introduction*), manuscript, available at `http://www.renyi.hu/~candelap/unn-notes.pdf`.

[4] D. Conlon, J. Fox and Y. Zhao, *A relative Szemerédi theorem*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 25 (2015), 733–762.

[5] D. Conlon, J. Fox and Y. Zhao, *Linear forms from the Gowers uniformity norm*, companion note to [4], available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.5565`.

[6] P. Dodos, V. Kanellopoulos and Th. Karageorgos, *L_p regular sparse hypergraphs*, preprint (2015).

[7] A. Frieze and R. Kannan, *Quick approximation to matrices and applications*, Combinatorica 19 (1999), 175–220.

[8] W. T. Gowers, *A new proof of Szemerédi's theorem*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 11 (2001), 465–588.

[9] W. T. Gowers, *Quasirandomness, counting and regularity for 3-uniform hypergraphs*, Comb. Prob. Comput. 15 (2006), 143–184.

[10] W. T. Gowers, *Hypergraph regularity and the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem*, Ann. Math. 166 (2007), 897–946.

[11] B. Green and T. Tao, *The primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions*, Ann. Math. 167 (2008), 481–547.

[12] B. Green and T. Tao, *Linear equations in primes*, Ann. Math. 171 (2010), 1753–1850.

[13] H. Hatami, *On Generalizations of Gowers Norms*, Thesis, University of Toronto, 2009.

[14] L. Lovász, *Large Networks and Graph Limits*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. 60, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.

[15] T. Tao, *A variant of the hypergraph removal lemma*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A 113 (2006), 1257–1280.

[16] T. Tao, *The Gaussian primes contain arbitrarily shaped constellations*, J. Anal. Math. 99 (2006), 109–176.

Department of Mathematics, University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis 157 84, Athens, Greece

E-mail address: pdodos@math.uoa.gr

National Technical University of Athens, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Zografou Campus, 157 80, Athens, Greece

E-mail address: bkanel@math.ntua.gr

Department of Mathematics, University of Athens, Panepistimiopolis 157 84, Athens, Greece

E-mail address: tkarageo@math.uoa.gr